



RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE AGENDA
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JANUARY 6, 2003

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW

MINUTES:

PRESENT: COUNCILMEN WEEKLY and MACK

Also Present: MAYOR OSCAR B. GOODMAN (excused after 4:26 p.m.), CITY MANAGER DOUG SELBY, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS, CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC (excused after 4:26 p.m.), CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED, CITY CLERK BARBARA JO (RONI) RONEMUS, and DEPUTY CITY CLERK GABRIELA S. PORTILLO-BRENNER

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE – meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas Library, 833 Las Vegas Boulevard North

Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road

Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy

Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall

City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(4:02)

1-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JANUARY 6, 2003

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

ABEYANCE ITEM - **Bill No. 2002-140** – Revises the licensing requirements and regulations pertaining to erotic dance establishments and entertainers who perform therein. Proposed by: Mark Vincent, Director of Finance and Business Services

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill represents the efforts of the City's licensing staff over the last number of years, in cooperation with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and the erotic dance industry, to update the City's licensing regulations that apply to that industry. The bill requires entertainers to obtain a business license instead of a work card. The bill also clarifies certain limitations on the operation of erotic dance establishments and the types of conduct that may occur therein.

RECOMMENDATION:

Held in abeyance to 1/6/2003 at the 12/16/2002 Recommending Committee meeting.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-140

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-140 be tabled pending meetings with the industry and other interested parties. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

JIM DiFIORE, Manager of Business Services, advised that many months, since the City's work card reformation, have been spent reviewing the erotic dance code with a view toward licensing dancers. A much-improved process has been identified and would eliminate the work card requirement. A temporary license would be granted upon application. A background investigation would be conducted if it had not already been completed as part of a prior work-card process. There are regulations to be imposed that are more specifically designed for the activity being conducted. The responsibility does still somewhat fall on the club owners who will be responsible for some

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 1– Bill No. 2002-140

MINUTES – Continued:

activities, but activities will be more closely scrutinized. The fees are revenue-neutral and simply offset the time dedicated to the licensing. Staff will be looking at compliance with the business licensing code. Criminal activity will still remain in the hands of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro). It is believed that this will improve the code and staff recommended approval.

MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that the City is doing fine as things exist. To identify this proposal as an attempt to generate revenue is disingenuous. The City does not want to be involved in the same silliness as the County. He said that he could not support this item.

TOM McGOWAN, a local resident, questioned the effect on other entertainment in the same establishments. He cited examples of comics, piano players and vocalists. A person can become offended by anything they want to find offensive. He requested that all the details of the proposal be presented and explained. MR. DiFIORE advised that the proposed bill only impacts the entertainers and erotic dance establishments. It would not affect any other type of entertainment. MR. McGOWAN suggested that the bill be renamed the “unemployment act of 2003.” MR. DiFIORE responded that significant research using other entities, meetings were held with the industry and legal representatives of the industry to address the administration and enforcement of licensing.

ANDREA HACKETT, Las Vegas Dancers Alliance, concurred with the statements made by MAYOR GOODMAN and opposed the proposal. Clearly a revenue increase of 650% is a scheme to make money. Her organization also opposes language that permits denial of a business license solely on an arrest or statement of a police officer. The constitutionality of this language was challenged in 1999 and should be removed. She questioned the equity of exempting casino/hotels with more than 300 rooms.

GARY PECK, Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada, agreed with MS. HACKETT. He outlined concerns with the proposal involving the need to keep regulation of First Amendment protected activities revenue neutral. That does not appear to be the case in this instance. Secondly, there is a core principle that an individual is innocent until proven guilty and a denial cannot therefore be based upon a mere allegation or arrest. This is a critical point. If the regulation sets a situation where the Council determines guilt or innocence, that discretion is unconstitutional and cannot withstand a legal challenge. Lastly, the exemption for casino/hotels is obviously political and not based on legal analysis. It raises serious equal protection issues and also cannot withstand a legal challenge. He urged the Council to play by the rules established by the Constitution.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 1– Bill No. 2002-140

MINUTES – Continued:

ATTORNEY DEAN PATTI, 300 East Charleston, appeared representing Crazy Horse Two. He read a statement regarding concerns that were forwarded to Mr. DiFIORE. Those concerns include a responsibility on establishment licensees for employees and independent contractors. The purpose for licensing the dancers was to put more responsibility on the dancers. Another concern is with allowing Metro 72 hours to grant the initial work card. That creates a burden on the daily operation for the club and forces the dancers to come up with the money for the license up front. In addition to the added \$150 licensing fee, Metro may be allowed to charge fees for fingerprinting and investigation. It is important to clarify that fee. The biggest concern was that discussions over the past year involved a uniform arrangement for both the County and the City. In the event different regulations are established, businesses will simply leave the City and relocate into the County.

AL LICHTENSTEIN, 3315 Russell Road, appeared representing a number of people present at the hearing. Most of his comments were made by other speakers. He commended MR. DiFIORE for working with the industry. However, the revenue-neutrality is a clear finding of the courts. Arrest versus conviction has always been a problem, but this proposal extends beyond the dancers and principals to anyone with any involvement in the real estate itself. Under LVMC 6.02.010, as identified on Page 4, Line 8, the City has the right to extend the need for investigation at will. That type of discretion exceeds what the courts have settled as matters of law. There are some good ideas within the proposed bill, but more work is needed to avoid litigation.

RUSSELL ROWE, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the Devoir Brothers. His clients are building the Boardroom and have not yet taken a position on the bill. He raised questions regarding the dance area and whether the language would prohibit a second-floor dance area. The definition of employee/employer includes independent contractor and he requested clarification. The dancers age limitation in both alcoholic and non-alcoholic establishments is unclear. The limitation on weapons held by security guards may require additional consideration given the volume of cash in these types of establishments. MR. DiFIORE responded that he would meet with the individual and industry collectively to address all of the issues raised. There is room for improvement. He also assured COUNCILMAN WEEKLY that he has written clarification of all the points raised at this time that can be reviewed at such a collective meeting.

MAYOR GOODMAN added that trying to regulate activities that are difficult to define creates problems. The City is doing fine with the industry, with the understanding that prostitution is illegal and any such acts by an establishment's employees will result in a loss of license. A determination of legal versus illegal activities is not for the Council to make.

LARRY LAPINTA, owner of Larry's Villa, objected to the hiring of 18 year-olds in establishments where alcohol is served. MAYOR GOODMAN replied that the proposed bill would not change the 21 year-old requirement.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 1– Bill No. 2002-140

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN MACK stated that although he understood the desire to protect tourists, valid concerns were raised. He confirmed with MR. DiFIORE a clarification that no one under 21 is allowed to be on or loitering on property of an establishment which sells alcoholic beverages, including entertainers between 18 and 21 years old, except for those businesses that have a tavern/restaurant separated by a barrier creating a separate entrance into the restaurant for those under 21. COUNCILMAN MACK expressed a concern with forcing those between 18 and 21 to totally nude businesses or escort businesses. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC explained that the bill does not include any age related regulation, the City simply defers to State law.

CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC opined that since the bill had not been published, the bill could be tabled and action delayed for up to six months. It would be appropriate to table the item and direct staff to work with the industry and other interested parties. If the recommendation of this Committee is to table the item, the table will actually take place at the City Council meeting of 1/8/2003. CITY CLERK RONEMUS added that the item is not agendaed for the 1/8/2003 Council meeting as a public hearing and therefore no additional comments could be taken at that time.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY directed MR. DiFIORE to provide all interested parties with a contact number so that they may be involved in the proposed collective meeting.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:03 – 4:28)

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JANUARY 6, 2003

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-142 – Amends the zoning regulations to provide a mechanism for the approval of uses that, because of an applicant's inability to meet certain conditions, cannot be approved as a matter of right. Proposed by: Robert S. Genzer, Director of Planning and Development

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

Section 19.04.060 of the Municipal Code describes a number of uses that, from the zoning perspective, can be permitted as a matter of right in specified zoning districts if certain minimum conditions are met. The Code currently does not provide a mechanism for allowing those uses in cases where not all the minimum conditions can be met. This bill will remedy the situation by providing that approval of such uses may be obtained by means of special use permit.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-142

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-142 be forwarded to the Full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

MARGO WHEELER, Manager of Planning & Development, indicated that this is a clean up of the existing code and would provide for appeal of certain applications.

No one appeared in opposition and there was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:28 – 4:29)

1-789

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JANUARY 6, 2003

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-143 – Permits restricted gaming at supper club business establishments. Proposed by Mark Vincent, Director, Finance and Business Services

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill will permit supper club business establishments to have slot machines. A maximum of ten slot machines will be permitted in establishments having at least five thousand square feet of usable floor space. Not more than five slot machines will be permitted in establishments having less than five thousand square feet of usable floor space.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-143

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-143 be forwarded to the Full Council with no recommendation. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

NOTE: COUNCILMAN MACK disclosed that his brother-in-law ANDREW DONNER owns the Timbers Hospitality Group restaurants and taverns. Since any impact would be neutral or negative, he was making the disclosure but would not abstain on this item.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

JIM DiFIORE, Manager of Business Services, stated that the intent of this proposed bill is to lighten the restrictions currently imposed on supper clubs and allow for up to 10 gaming machines in establishments over 5,000 square feet. Establishments less than 5,000 square feet would be permitted up to 5 gaming machines. Both Henderson and Clark County have supper club provisions

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 3– Bill No. 2002-143

MINUTES – Continued:

which allow for up to 5 gaming machines. Pursuant to the Gaming Code, this proposed bill will require a public hearing which staff will schedule at the City Council level, should the bill go forward. CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED commented that such a public hearing may take place either prior to or at the same meeting, but prior to, adoption of the bill. MR. DiFIORE verified that no approval would be required at the State level, although applicants would still require State gaming approval.

TOM McGOWAN, Las Vegas resident, asked whether the bill would impact the downtown entertainment district in any way. MR. DiFIORE responded that it would not since currently no gaming is allowed in that particular area and licenses within the area are tavern-limited rather than supper club licenses. MR. McGOWAN pointed out that the limitation could create a burden with regards to competition and questioned potential offsets for that potential. MR. DiFIORE replied that the matter had not been contemplated at this time.

MR. McGOWAN requested information regarding the origination of the bill and the related homework/research conducted pertaining to the proposed bill. MR. DiFIORE stated that the push for the change came from the industry itself.

RON DRAKE, President of Nevada Tavern Ownership Association, appeared in opposition to the proposed bill. The purpose of the supper club license was to permit restaurants to operate in proximity of existing taverns. Permitting gaming allows the restaurant to operate as a tavern. Supper club licensees invest less than the \$60,000 plus \$2,400 per year in fees invested by tavern owners. That is not right. The money generated by the taverns stays in the community while the money generated in these other chain supper clubs, even through gaming, does not stay in this community. He recommended that, if this were to pass, the maximum number of machines for taverns should return to 20.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY discussed with MR. DiFIORE the lack of outreach regarding this proposed bill with the tavern owners. The points raised are very valid. There will be additional discussion on this matter, but there should be dialogue with the tavern industry before moving forward.

RAY SHAPIRO, 3321 North Buffalo, pointed out that the bill actually identifies applicable supper clubs as having 5,000 square feet of usable floor space. He expressed a concern with the definition of that, especially with other City standards such as parking requirements that could become prohibitive. That would end up requiring a 7,000 square foot or greater building. Portions such as the kitchens, bathrooms, offices and storage areas are not included in that calculation. Perhaps a smaller number would be more viable. MR. DiFIORE concurred that the usable floor space is the applicable language and it would be space devoted to the serving of alcoholic beverages and dining for the restaurant patrons.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 3– Bill No. 2002-143

MINUTES – Continued:

BOB PECCOLE, 823 West Charleston Boulevard, summarized two concerns involving distance requirements or exemptions thereof and the impact of Gaming Control Board distance restrictions between gaming establishments and schools and churches. He recommended that the City begin coordinating more with the State.

COUNCILMAN MACK confirmed with MR. DiFIORE that the fee structure would not be changed. Tavern licenses pay the \$60,000 liquor license fee and a separate gaming license fee based on the number of machines.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:29 – 4:39)

1-815

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JANUARY 6, 2003

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-144 – Revises the zoning requirements for various types of financial institutions and businesses. Sponsored by: Councilman Michael J. McDonald

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill responds to the growing number of financial-related businesses (check-cashing, paycheck advance, auto title loan, auto pawn) that recently have been established without adequate consideration of their zoning impact. The bill will establish standards and requirements to ensure that the establishment of these businesses is compatible with surrounding areas.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-144

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY recommended Bill 2002-144 be forwarded to the Full Council with no recommendation.

NOTE: COUNCILMAN MACK disclosed that since both he and his brother are in the pawnshop/lending business, which might create a commercial competition, he would abstain on this matter.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

MARGO WHEELER, Manager of Planning & Development, stated that this bill is a result of questions, concerns and to bring the City zoning code up to the standard of other zoning codes in the area, the State and the City's own business code. When issues are brought to the attention of staff that have not been individually addressed, staff reviews and attempts to clarify the code. The City code

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 4– Bill No. 2002-144

MINUTES – Continued:

does not currently have a definition for check-cashing or cash-advance uses. The City does address the use in the business code, but not in the zoning code as does the County, Henderson and North Las Vegas. These uses are currently included under financial institutions, but the citizens of an area where such a business opens does not view them as the same. Staff is proposing to create a definition for the uses and require a special use permit in some zoning designations and a conditional use permit in other zoning designations. This bill would also provide definitions for auto pawn and auto title uses. Conditions have been drafted with regard to the storage of vehicles on-site, signage and other design criteria.

J.T. MORAN, III, Moran & Associates, 630 South Fourth Street, appeared on behalf of the Association of Lenders and said that there needs to be some regulation of this particular industry, but the actual interest rate should not be included in that regulation, as that falls under the jurisdiction of the State. There are many concerns and it would be more appropriate to identify and address those in a meeting with the Mayor, COUNCILMEN WEEKLY and McDONALD, the City Attorney and other City staff. The Association is willing to make changes, but not to the degree where it is prohibitive to making a living. This is another instance where bad operators ruin things for the good operators. Certainly the Association has the experience to help make this a win-win situation. He submitted a booklet, which was not submitted for the record, to the Committee members to clarify how good operators do business, solicit business and operate. For the record, he questioned the wisdom of the first-come, first in that distance requirements would create. He requested the Association be noticed of all hearings on such licenses. He introduced JIM MARQUESE, President of the Association of Lenders, who would be happy to provide expert information regarding the industry at any time to the Council.

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of Money Tree. The hours of operation language would be better addressed during the individual special use permit process. They would like to see language added exempting current licensed locations.

JOHN VERGILS, lobbyist for the Check Cashing Association in Carson City, introduced himself and advised that he would be working on these issues up at the legislature.

TOM AMICK, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of Super Pawn in order to seek clarification on whether this bill would apply to existing pawnshops and the impact of the restrictions contained within this bill on such businesses, should existing business wish to expand into check-cashing in the future.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 4– Bill No. 2002-144

MINUTES – Continued:

JIM MARQUESE, President of Nevada Financial Services Association, added that he is the owner of Check City, which has ten locations. There are many stereotypes from when this type of business first began, even though the business has vastly changed over the years. These uses will expand, but consolidate under strong operators in the future. Signage has already been addressed and the industry is very willing to discuss other issues such as aesthetics. Unfortunately, the bill as drafted today groups very different businesses into one lump, but other business that provided or may provide similar services are not included. This creates an unfair competitive advantage. All the industry wants is a free-market and the ability to compete. The free-market will take care of itself.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY discussed with DOUG RANKIN, Liaison for COUNCILMAN McDONALD, that constituents contacted COUNCILMAN McDONALD about the proliferation and lack of aesthetic control over these businesses. In researching the concerns, it was discovered that the County had a distance separation that staff felt might be applicable within the City as well.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY indicated that his recommendation to send the matter forward with no recommendation would allow COUNCILMAN McDONALD to clarify his position. He directed MS. WHEELER have dialogue with the various institutions and organizations who have a vested interest prior to moving forward with this proposed bill.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:39 – 4:54)

1-1190

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE**RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JANUARY 6, 2003**

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY**DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC**☐**CONSENT**☒**DISCUSSION****SUBJECT:**

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-145 – Repeals and replaces LVMC Chapter 6.50, relating to liquor control, and revises related zoning provisions. Proposed by: Mark Vincent, Director, Finance and Business Services

Fiscal Impact☒**No Impact****Amount:**☐**Budget Funds Available****Dept./Division:**☐**Augmentation Required****Funding Source:****PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:**

In addition to adding new alcoholic beverage licensing categories for banquet facilities, convention facilities, nonprofit club restaurant service bars, billiard parlors, convenience stores, art galleries, art studios, buses and limousines this bill reorganizes the presentation of the existing alcoholic beverage regulations, including moving related zoning matters from Chapter 6.50 to Title 19 of the City Code. Special use permit regulations for unlicensed locations hosting social events with alcoholic beverage sales are also established.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-145

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-145 be held in ABEYANCE to the 2/3/2003 Recommending Committee meeting. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

NOTE: COUNCILMAN MACK disclosed that his brother-in-law ANDREW DONNER owns the Timbers Hospitality Group restaurants and taverns. Since any impact would be neutral or negative, he was making the disclosure but would not abstain on this item.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2003

City Attorney

Item 5– Bill No. 2002-145

MINUTES – Continued:

JIM DiFIORE, Manager of Business Services, stated that this item came before the Recommending Committee faster than anticipated. He requested that the bill be held in abeyance to the 2/3/2003 Recommending Committee meeting in order that he might meet with the liquor industry in an attempt to gain their support of the bill. He provided his direct telephone number in order that those present could contact him to organize such a meeting.

No one spoke in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:54 – 4:58)

1-1785



RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE AGENDA
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: JANUARY 6, 2003

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION: ITEMS RAISED UNDER THIS PORTION OF THE AGENDA CANNOT BE DELIBERATED OR ACTED UPON UNTIL THE NOTICE PROVISIONS OF THE OPEN MEETING LAW HAVE BEEN MET. IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK ON A MATTER NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA, PLEASE CLEARLY STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS. IN CONSIDERATION OF OTHERS, AVOID REPETITION, AND LIMIT YOUR COMMENTS TO NO MORE THAN THREE (3) MINUTES. TO ENSURE ALL PERSONS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK, EACH SUBJECT MATTER WILL BE LIMITED TO TEN (10) MINUTES.

MINUTES:

TOM McGOWAN, Las Vegas resident, questioned the policy and process of the City government in holding this type of Recommending Committee meetings only to abey or table items. Homework should be done so as to not waste the time of those who attend these meetings. Also, the two elected officials acting on this Committee should take action, not make recommendations. This is a quality-assurance matter.

(4:58 – 5:00)

1-1922

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted: _____

GABRIELA S. PORTILLO-BRENNER

January 16, 2003